

**REFUTATION OF ARGUMENT OF
DOUBT AGAINST DIVINE ESSENCE
BARROWED FROM THEOLOGY AND LOGIC ON
SCRIBD**

[Pick the date]

ZAHIR

ANSWERING THE ALLEGED “MOST DANGEROUS ARGUMENT” AGAINST DIVINE ESSENCE MADE BY LEARN2DRAW ON YOU TUBE

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lr75c1cYlbc&pbjreload=10>

A number of atheists think that the gOOgOplex argument is very dangerous against G-D..Actually this argument does not disprove G-D but attempts to make some non serious doubts in the article of faith of EXISTENCE OF G-D in major religions like JUDAISM,CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM.

But if this argument is analyzed logically it revers and reduces to old atheism.

Statement of the argument.

When Some one claimed to be G-D in front of the founder of any religion, the claimer (claimer) may not be G-D but gOOgOplex.

A gOOgOplex [Googoplex] is defined by the **Learn2Draw** as a being which is very powerful , a very large in size

and very intelligent/Rational , knowing almost every thing in the Cosmos/world Universe/

Multiverse what so ever it is BUT IS FINTE IN STS SUBSTANCE,PROPERTIES AND QUALITIES.

IN A NUT SHELL IT IS a very **powerful,intellegent** old SUPPOSITUM.

A modification in the concept of gOOgOplex is c00c0plex which IS A FINITE POWERFUL INTELLEGENT SUPPOSITUM .which

may be a spirit or size-less but very very old.

What so ever they may be they have one thing in common they can claim to be G-D

when they are not, and have power to deceive each and every human being that each one of them is

G-D.

Let us return EITHER OF THE supposed being as Suppositum X or simply X..

It is claimed that this being has made heavens, paradises and heavenly hells.

To analyze this alternative let us study the following four possible cases.

There are Only four possible cases.

1)G-d and X both exist.

2)G-D exists but X does not.

3)G-D does not exists but X exists.

4)Neither of them exists.

If the case cases 2,4 are true then it is very clear that this arguments of doubt

fails.

Since if there is no X then it can never claim to be G-D.

If the 3 is true then the whole argument reduces to old atheism, that is their
is no G-D.

So it is nothing new, since all the atheists inspite of their internal disputes appear to disbelieve in G-D.

They ask for a proof of G-D and then try to find ERRORS in the proofs presented
to them.

It is useless to discuss that if there is no G-D then which thing/being claimed
to be G-D where it be gOOgOplex OR
G00g0plex or SATAN or a DECIEVER.etc.

So this case is nothing but our old rival ATHEISM.

THE CASE ONE IS HOWEVER INTERESTING.

G-D is a PERFECT BEING .G-D is PERFECT in both types of His Attributes and Quali
ties 1} Essential or Divine.

2) Active or Relative.

. The Only DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BOTH TYPES OF attributes and qualities IS THAT TH

E FORMER STATED ATR BEYOUND THE DIVINE POWER while THE LATTER STATED ARE IN DIV
INE POWER.

Discussions on the distinction is beyond the scope of present ARTICLE..

If God creates a being like X so powerful that the being can easily convinced an
y one to be G-D ,this means G-D has done an UNWISE ACT/ACTION/ACTIVITY/WORK/DOING
what so ever it may be termed.

To Create/Make a being so powerful that it can confuse the very existence of G-D
it self is Unwise. It is similar to lie.

It is just like to argue that if G-D can speak a FALSE STATEMENT why should he
not do so in general , and deny that HE is Not G-D in particular

The simple answer is that Divine perfection demands that Essential A ttribites must be beyond Divine
Power and Active Attributes are not violated, even if they are

in Divine Power. Again any debate on this issue as stated above/earlier
is beyond the scope of present ARTICLE. Further if G-D HAS CREATED SUCH A SUPPOSITUM X then G-D
can easily destroy the SUPPOSITUM rather ANNHILATE the said Suppositum, for his crime of claiming to
be G-D which the SUPPOSTUM X is surely NOT

Now we once more come to the case G-D does not Exist but X exists.

According to this case their is no Eternal/sempiternal being hence consequently
no G-D.

As there is no G-D THERE IS NO ONE TO STOP THIS SUPPOSITUM X from claiming to be
G-d and deceiving others.

However we see that each and every disbeliever in G-D suggest some alternative
for the revelations believed to be Divine.

But this is not a disprove OF BELIEF IN G-D.

In this case the alternative has been definitized as SUPPOSITUM X.

iN ORDER TO doubt in the belief in the Existence of G-D by using this argument ,

a doubt in the EXISTENCE of G-D is pre-requisit. This makes this argument nothing but just a new form of the old argument which is far more logical and which can be stated as follow:

Even if there is a G-D , the proofs/evidences of His Existence are Not Convincing..

BUT even this doubt in G-D can not make a shadow of doubt in the Existence of G-D.

Further supposing that there is such a SUPPOSITUM X then either There Is a G-D or no G-D.

IF NO G-D THEN THIS X is a **demigod** like Gods and Goddesses of Pagan religion eg :ZEUS , HERA etc. rather more powerful than them.

If there is G-D then this X must be an intelligent Suppositum and a rational suppositum ,there fore it must know that the best way is to be obedient to G-D and would never ever try to claim to be G-D.

In fact there are a number of sects of some religions who believe that some persons are even more powerful then this suppositum X, some of them go beyond rationality by claiming that their respective temporal **knowledges** are equal to the Eternal knowledge of G-D.

CONSEQUENTLY THEY CAN SAY THE SAME THING FOR POWER. ANY HOW THEY BELIEVE SAINTS

,PROPHET ARE MUKHTAR AL KULL (ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY/IKHTIAR AL KULLI/**OMNIVOLENT**) HAD:IR WA NAZ:IR (**OMNIPRESENT**) etc. making saints and Prophets more powerful then Suppositum X yet they believe that they are obedient to G-D.

HOW EVER THERE THESE VIEWS ARE INCORRECT AND ABSOLUTELY WRONG FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF ORTHODOX CERCLES OF THEIR RELIGIONS BUT THE POINT IS THAT ATHIESTS HAVE DONE NOTHING NEW.

Such suppositums / supposita can not make doubts in the Existence OF G-D.

One may argue as given below:

When some one claims THAT G-D spoke to the FOUNDER of his Religion, and an ATHIEST some time tries to make doubt by asking several questions and one of them is about a Suppositum X.

But when it is asked immediately four cases are implied which can be REDUCED/REVERTED to two cases each one can be divided to TWO subsases.

1) IF G-D EXIST 2) IF G-D does not EXIST.

IF G-D DOES EXIST Then it is immaterial whether Suppositum X exists or NOT.

If G-D does not EXIST Then it is immaterial whether Suppositum X exists or NOT.

Thus this doubt is based UPON the DOUBT in Existence OF G-D, And it is not an independent doubt, therefore It DEPENDS

Upon the doubt in G-D and not some thing which makes doubt in the Existence of G-D.

When shall these ATHIESTS learn from GREAT ALTHIESTS LIKE RUSSEL etc. Great Atheist scholars do not make such FALACIES as these not so great athiests make.

A QUESTION TO ONLY THOSE ATHIESTS WHO MAKE USE OF SUPPOSITUM X DOUBT.

Suppose that there is a Suppositum X; AND Let It Be not G-D; Then It is Not Eternal, which implies it is TEMPORAL which implies it has a Beginning. Now it is up to these Athiests to explain how this Suppositum came in Existence.

Unless the Atheists present some possible grounds for the coming of this suppositum in existence, they can not use this

SUPPOSED SUPPOSITUM to make doubt in Existence of G-D.

IT IS SHOWN THAT NEITHER THIS ARGUMENT IS DANGEROUS NOR IT IS ANY THING NEW, RATHER IT IS THE OLD ARGUMENT IN ESSENCE WITH NEW STYLE.

This answer was uploaded initially by

<https://www.scribd.com/user/60413897/TheologyAndLogic>

We have borrowed it after some revisions.

